



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,705	03/09/2004	Scott Meredith	M61.12-0596	2881
27366	7590	01/28/2008		
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)			EXAMINER	
SUITE 1400			TAKELE, MESEKER	
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3319			2174	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/28/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/796,705	Applicant(s) MEREDITH, SCOTT
	Examiner MESEKER TAKELE	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7,9,10,14-16, 18 and 19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 11/07/2007.
2. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18 and 19 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 16 and 19 are independent claims. In the instant Amendment, claims 1, 16 and 19 were amended and claim 8, 11-13, 17 and 20 was canceled.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
6. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moore (US Pub No: 2002/0078069) in view of Richards et al.

("Richards" US Patent No.: 5,995,921) and in further view of Wochler et al. ("Wochler" US Patent No.: 7,243,092).

As to claim 1, Moore discloses a computer-implemented method for creating a task identifier for identifying a file within a system for providing help content to a computer operator (paragraph [0027] – [0035]), the method comprising:

providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements that together form the task identifier (paragraph [0027] – [0035]), the task identifier being indicative of a help-related task described in the content of the file;

However Moore does not explicitly disclose help-related task described in the content of the file.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose help-related task described in the content of the file (Figure 2 (element 228) and abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Richards. The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

The modified Moore does not explicitly discloses
(a) arranging the plurality of elements in accordance with a predetermined order of linguistic structural components;

Art Unit: 2174

(b) receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the limited set of word selections (paragraph 27-35); and (c) assigning said word selection to represent the first of the plurality of elements.

Woehtler from the same field of endeavor disclose (a) arranging the plurality of elements in accordance with a predetermined order of linguistic structural components (col., 1 lines, 13-30);

(b) receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the limited set of word selections (Figure 2 (element 222)); and

(c) assigning said word selection to represent the first of the plurality of elements (Figure 2 (element 228)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Woehtler. The motivation to combine provide generating a large number of meaningful terms from a document collection, creating a taxonomy from these terms, and filling the taxonomy with documents from the collection.

As to claim 2, Woehtler discloses providing the user with a second limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a second of the plurality of elements; receiving a second selection from the user that is indicative of a word selection from the second limited set of word selections; and assigning said word selection from the second limited set of word selections to represent the second of the plurality of elements (Figure 4).

As to claim 3, Moore discloses wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements

Art Unit: 2174

comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an object element (paragraph [0027] – [0035]).

As to claim 4, Moore discloses, wherein providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent a first of a plurality of elements comprises providing a user with a limited set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an action element (paragraph [0027] – [0035]).

As to claim 5, Woehler discloses, further comprising a step of assigning said file to at least one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1 (element 135)).

As to claim 6, Woehler discloses, further comprising a step of assigning said file to more than one taxonomic category based on the selection received from the user (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1, (element 135)).

As to claim 7, Moore discloses wherein the pluralities of elements are arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure of organizational elements (paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 9, Moore discloses a task identifier used to indicate a content of a file within a computer-implemented system for providing help content to a user (paragraph 27-35),

However Moore does not explicitly disclose (a) providing help content (b) an action element delineated as being affiliated.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose (a) providing help content (Figure 2 (element 228) and abstract).

(b) an action element delineated as being affiliated (col2, lines, 10-25 and col., 9 lines, 40-45).

Art Unit: 2174

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

The modified Moore does not explicitly disclose more than one taxonomic category, said action element selected from a limited set of action choices.

Wochler from the same field of endeavor disclose more than one taxonomic category, said action element selected from a limited set of action choices (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1 (element 135)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Wochler.

The motivation to combine provide generating a large number of meaningful terms from a document collection, creating a taxonomy from these terms, and filling the taxonomy with documents from the collection.

As to claim 10, Moore discloses further comprising at least one object element selected from a limited set of object choices (paragraph [0027] – [0035]).

As to claim 14, Moore discloses wherein the task identifier further comprises a plurality of elements arranged in accordance with a predetermined structure (paragraph [0021]).

As to claim 15, Richards disclose wherein the task identifier further comprises a plurality of elements arranged in accordance with a predetermined order of linguistic

Art Unit: 2174

structural components, more specifically in accordance with a predetermined order of categories of parts of speech (col., 1 line, 65 and col., 15 line, 1).

As to claim 16, Moore discloses a computer-implemented method for at least semi-automatically applying a taxonomic classification to a file to be incorporated into a system for providing help content to a user (paragraph [0024] – [0035]) and providing a user with the set of word selections that can be assigned to represent an element of a task identifier, the task identifier indicative of a help-related task described in the content of the file (paragraph [0027] - [0035]).

However Moore does not explicitly disclose providing help content.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose (a) providing help content (Figure 2 (element 228) and abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Richards.

The motivation to combine to provide an improved help interface capable of receiving user-defined queries in a natural language and selecting the most appropriate answer from a plurality of potential answers through which user can interact with software.

The modified Moore further does not disclose (a) assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word Selection from a set of word selections; (b) receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of the first word selection from the set of word selections, the first word selection having a meaning that is indicative of the help-related task; and (c) assigning the first taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user; (d) _assigning a second taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set

Art Unit: 2174

of word selections; and assigning the second taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user.

Woeehler from the same field of endeavor disclose (a) assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word Selection from a set of word selections (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1 (element 135)); (b) receiving a selection from the user that is indicative of the first word selection from the set of word selections, the first word selection having a meaning that is indicative of the help-related task (Figure 2); and (c) assigning the first taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user (Figure 2); (d) assigning a second taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections; and assigning the second taxonomic category to the file based on the selection received from the user (col., 1 lines, 15-21, Figure 4 and Figure 1 (element 135)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Woeehler.

The motivation to combine provide generating a large number of meaningful terms from a document collection, creating a taxonomy from these terms, and filling the taxonomy with documents from the collection.

As to claim 18, Woeehler discloses, wherein assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word selection from a set of word selections further comprises assigning a first taxonomic category to a first word selection from a limited set of word selections (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1 (element 135)).

As to claim 19, Moore discloses assigning a task identifier to each of the plurality of help files; wherein each task identifier includes an element selected from a limited vocabulary (paragraph [0027] - [0035]).

Art Unit: 2174

However Moore does not explicitly disclose computer-implemented method for sorting a plurality of help files within a system for providing help content.

Richards from the same field of endeavor disclose computer-implemented method for sorting plurality of help files (Figure 6E (element 648) and Figure 2 (element 228)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Richards.

The motivation to combine provides computing and ranking the cumulative values of the potential answers, to present user with the highest ranking value answer in response to the query.

The modified Moore does not disclose a taxonomic category.

Woehler from the same field of endeavor disclose taxonomic category (col., 1 lines, 15-21 and Figure 1 (element 135)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Moore's teaching at the time of the invention was made with the teaching of Woehler.

The motivation to combine provide generating a large number of meaningful terms from a document collection, creating a taxonomy from these terms, and filling the taxonomy with documents from the collection.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2174

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MESEKER TAKELE whose telephone number is (571)270-1653. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30AM-5:00PM est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. T./
Examiner, Art Unit 2174

**/David A Wiley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174**